

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 35 and 66. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 35-37, 40-42, 44-45, 47-57 and 63-68 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **2.) Examiner Objections - Claims**

Claim 66 was objected to because of informalities. Again, the Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the claims. The Applicant has amended the claim as suggested by the Examiner in order to correct the informalities. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

### **3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner objected to Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant has amended the claim to correct the antecedent basis for "said access request." The Examiner's consideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

### **4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 35-37, 41, 44-45, 47, 53, 57, 63 and 65-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Barrett, *et al.* (US 6,581,059). The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that Barrett discloses an information server 100 that includes a web server 112 connected to an access interface 102, which is connected to a personal information database 118 and a set of information preferences 120 (Figure 1). The access interface 102 receives a request from a requestor via the web server 112 (col. 6, lines 19-27) and determines whether the request will be granted or denied based on a set of information preferences 102 (col. 6, lines 27-30). If granted,

the access interface 102 obtains the requested data from the personal information database 118, and then provides the obtained data to the requestor (col. 6, lines 50-52). As a result, the access interface 102 performs two functions: (1) approves or denies the request; and (2) provides the requested information if the request is approved. Applicant respectfully submits that Barrett does not identically disclose all the elements recited in claim 35 as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In contrast, claim 35 recites a requesting application that provides an access request to certain personal profile data associated with a particular user to the central server. The central server grants or rejects the request. If the request is granted, the requesting application subsequently requests the certain personal profile data from the information providing application. The requested information is provided by the information providing application; not the central server. Applicant respectfully submits that Barrett does not disclose, teach or suggest at least the following: (1) the requesting application sends a subsequent request; (2) the requesting application sends the subsequent request to the information providing application; and (3) the requested data is not retrieved or provided to the requesting application by the central server. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 35 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Therefore, the allowance of claim 35 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 63 and 66 recite similar subject matter and are allowable for the reasons stated above.

Claims 36-37, 41, 44-45, 47, 53, 57, 65 and 67 depend from claims 35, 63 and 66, respectively and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 35, 63 and 66. Therefore, the allowance of claims 36-37, 41, 44-45, 47, 53, 57, 65 and 67 is respectfully requested.

#### **5.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 42, 48-51 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett, *et al.* (US 6,581,059) in view of Weschler, *et al.* (US 6,757,720); claim 52 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Hoyle (US 6,771,290); and claims 54-56, 61 and 66 stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Hind, *et al.* (US 6,826,690). The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested. The Applicant earnestly submits that these claims are allowable for the reasons stated above and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements thereof. Therefore, the allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

**6.) Prior Art Not Relied Upon**

In paragraph 32 on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Cameron  
Registration No. 50,298

Date: October 13, 2006

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145  
michael.cameron@ericsson.com